REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 1, 6, and 11. Favorable action is requested for new claims 17-35.

Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,872,261 to *Sanyal et al.* in view of JP 6-349663. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sanyal et al.* in view of JP 6-349663 and what the Examiner refers to as the applicant's admitted prior art.

Claim 1, as amended, defines a screen-printing plate comprising a screen plate provided with two or more printing patterns disposed in a single plate frame of the screen plate, each of the two or more printing patterns being formed with a plurality of mesh holes, wherein, for at least two of the at least two or more printing patterns, the shapes of the at least two printing patterns are substantially the same and a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a second size, wherein a first group of mesh holes is closer to a periphery of the plate frame than a second group of mesh holes and has holes that are larger than holes for the second group of mesh holes.

Sanyal does not disclose the features or combination of features of claim 1. For example, in *Sanyal*. the shapes of the patterns that would be printed by anything that could conceivably correspond to printing patterns as recited in claim 1 will be quite different.

In view of the differences between claim 1 and *Sanyal*, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Sanyal*.

Claim 6, as amended, defines a method for manufacturing an electronic device, comprising the steps of forming two or more printed patterns on a ceramic green sheet by pressing electrode paste through a plurality of mesh holes in two or more printing patterns in a screen-printing plate, wherein, for at least two of the two or more printing patterns, the shapes of the at least two printing patterns are substantially the same and a first one of the at least two or more printing patterns has mesh holes of a first size and a second one of the at least two or more print ing patterns has mesh holes of a second size, and wherein electrode paste is pressed through a first group of mesh holes in a first region of the screen-printing plate having the first size and a second group of mesh holes in a second region of the screen-printing plate having the second size, and the second region is proximate a peripheral frame of the screen-printing plate and the first region is proximate a center of the screen-printing plate wherein the first size is smaller than the second size.

Sanyal does not disclose the features or combination of features of claim 6. For example, in *Sanyal*. the shapes of the patterns that would be printed by anything that could conceivably correspond to printing patterns as recited in claim 6 will be quite different.

In view of the differences between claim 6 and *Sanyal*, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is not anticipated by *Sanyal*.

With respect to claim 11, which depends from claim 6, it is respectfully submitted that JP 6-349663 and what the Examiner refers to as the applicant's admitted prior art cure none of the defects of *Sanyal* with respect to claim 6 and, therefore, claim 6 and the claims dependent therefrom, including claim 11, define patentably over the cited references.

New claims 17-35 have been added. New claims 32-35 depend from claims 1 or 6. New claims 17-31 recite language to the effect that a combination of features includes that the shapes of the at least two printing patterns are substantially the same and the at least two printing patterns have different aperture ratios of the mesh holes. None of the cited references (including previously applied U.S. Patent No. 5,669,970 to *Balog et al.*) discloses or suggests the claimed combination of features. For example, the cited references do not disclose a combination of features wherein shapes of at least two printing patterns are substantially the same and the at least two printing patterns have different aperture ratios of mesh holes.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 1, 6, 11, and 17-35, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: Dec. 1, 2003

By: _____
Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620